REMARKS

I. Introduction

With the cancellation herein without prejudice of claim 12, and the addition of new claim 14, claims 5 to 11, 13, and 14 are currently pending in the present application. In view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all of the presently pending claims are allowable, and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for considering the Information Disclosure Statements and cited references filed between June 30, 2010 and October 25, 2010.

II. Rejection of Claim 12 Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

While Applicant does not agree with the merits of the rejection, to facilitate matters, the claim has been canceled, thereby rendering moot the present rejection.

III. Rejection of Claims 8, 9, and 11 Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Claims 8, 9, and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 7,000,161 ("the Allen reference"). The Allen reference does not anticipate any of the present claims, and the present rejection should be withdrawn, for at least the following reasons.

Each of claims 8, 9, and 11 refers to an interrupt. An interrupt is understood by one of ordinary skill in the art as a signal informing of an occurrence of an event. The basis of the rejection of claims 8, 9, and 11 is an overly broad interpretation of the term "interrupt," to mean any interruption in the running of a unit, which is different from how one of ordinary skill in the art would interpret the term. Nevertheless, to facilitate matters, each of the claims has been amended herein without prejudice to clarify that the interrupt is issued by a unit for requesting use of a reconfigurable unit. The mere occurrence in the Allen reference of an error which passively results in failure of a user application configuration to signal its successful loading is unrelated to an interrupt as required by each of claims 8, 9, and 11. The Allen reference therefore fails to disclose, or even suggest, the features of each of independent claims 8, 9, and 11 regarding the handling of an interrupt.

Accordingly, the Allen reference fails to disclose, or even suggest, all of the features of independent claims 8, 9, and 11, and therefore does not anticipate any of claims 8, 9, and 11.

Withdrawal of this anticipation rejection of claims 8, 9, and 11 is therefore respectfully requested.

IV. Rejection of Claims 5, 10, 12, and 13 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 5, 10, 12, and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable in view of the combination of U.S. Patent No. 6,658,564 ("the Smith reference"), the Allen reference, and U.S. Patent No. 6,076,157 ("the Borkenhagen reference"). The combination of the Smith, Allen, and Borkenhagen references does not render unpatentable any of the present claims, and the present rejection should be withdrawn, for at least the following reasons.

Claim 12 has been canceled herein without prejudice, thereby rendering moot the present rejection as applied to that claim.

The Allen reference is relied upon as assertedly disclosing the features concerning an interrupt in independent claims 5 and 10. Claims 5 and 10 have been amended for clarity, similar to the amendments to claims 8, 9, and 11 discussed above. The Allen reference is therefore unrelated to the features concerning the handling of an interrupt recited in claims 5 and 10 for at least essentially the same reasons set forth above in support of the patentability of claims 8, 9, and 11. The Smith and Borkenhagen references do not correct this critical deficiency of the Allen reference.

Accordingly, the combination of the Smith, Allen, and Borkenhagen references does not disclose or suggest all of the features of either of claims 5 and 10, and therefore does not render unpatentable either of claims 5 (and its dependent claim 13) and 10.

As further regards claim 13, the claim requires that a plurality of program instructions are executable via a single instance of the first configuration. None of the cited references refers to such a configuration handled as required by the claim. The Office Action asserts that claim 6 of the Smith reference discloses this feature. Claim 6 merely states that a single programmable logic resource may be allocated to a single block of configuration data that makes up a given function. That statement does not in any way indicate that more than one instruction is executable by the single block of configuration data. The reference to claim 6 of the Smith reference is therefore not understood, and claim 13 is allowable for at least this additional reason.

Withdrawal of this obviousness rejection is therefore respectfully requested.

V. Rejection of Claim 6 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claim 6 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over the combination of the Smith, Allen, and Borkenhagen references, in further view of "Parallel Counters For Signed Binary Signals" ("the Parhami reference"). The combination of the Smith, Allen, Borkenhagen, and Parhami references does not render unpatentable claim 6, and the rejection should be withdrawn, for at least the following reasons.

Claim 6 depends from claim 5 and is therefore allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 5, since the Parhami reference does not correct the critical deficiencies of the combination of the Smith, Allen, and Borkenhagen, references noted above.

Withdrawal of this obviousness rejection of claim 6 is therefore respectfully requested.

VI. Rejection of Claim 7 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claim 7 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over the combination of the Smith, Allen, and Borkenhagen, references, in further view of U.S. Patent No. 4,959,781 ("the Rubinstein reference"). The combination of the Smith, Allen, Borkenhagen, and Rubenstein references does not render unpatentable claim 7, and the rejection should be withdrawn, for at least the following reasons.

Claim 7 depends from claim 5 and is therefore allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 5, since the Rubenstein reference does not correct the critical deficiencies of the combination of the Smith, Allen, and Borkenhagen references noted above.

Withdrawal of this obviousness rejection of claim 7 is therefore respectfully requested.

VII. New Claim 14

Claim 14 has been added. Claim 14 does not add new matter and is supported by the application, including specification, as originally filed. Claim 14 depends from claim 13 and is therefore allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 13.

VIII. Conclusion

In light of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all of the presently pending claims are in condition for allowance. Prompt reconsideration and allowance of the present application are therefore earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: May 23, 2011

By: /Aaron Grunberger/
Aaron Grunberger
Reg. No. 59,210

KENYON & KENYON LLP
One Broadway
New York, New York 10004
(212) 425-7200

CUSTOMER NO. 26646